

cut. You want to promise more money for the military or more money for education or more money for veterans. And those promises add up to far more than we could ever possibly deliver. And as those promises add up, we dig ourselves a deeper and deeper hole so that when we actually get back to Congress or in the White House and we have to make the decisions that are necessary to move our country forward, we have that huge stack of promises coming up behind us that we do not think that we can get out from under.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I will close on a bipartisan note. While it is certainly true to say that the Republicans right now are behaving in a very fiscally irresponsible manner, they have turned on a dime from a rich history of fiscal responsibility for political reasons, it is fair to say that Democrats have not always been fiscally responsible either. In many cases they have supported more programs than our government can support. It is a bipartisan problem but it can also be fixed in a bipartisan manner. There are Republicans and there are many Democrats who believe in balanced budgets and fiscal responsibility. As a group, we need to rise up and make sure that our voices are heard and our policies get enacted. We can not afford to have deficits for as far as the eye can see. We certainly cannot afford to have \$4 trillion in deficits racked up over the course of the next 10 years.

If we do, future generations will be dealing with a mess of a size this country has not seen. Fiscal responsibility matters. Let us always remember that and pledge to work on it.

Mr. Speaker, before I am done I want to recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me before we yield back the remainder of our time. I think the gentleman has touched upon a very important point and we need to just restate it. And that is the essence of budgeting is all about decision making, but it should also be about taking responsibility for what is taking place today. And the easiest thing for a politician to be able to say to people back home or to run on the campaign is, You can have it all. You can have all these programs that you care about. We can fight this war in Iraq and do the rebuilding, and you can have large tax cuts on top of it and you can have it all.

But you cannot because decisions have to be made. And if you pursue that type of economic policy, if you pursue that type of political message, what you leave the American people then are these massive budget deficits because the current generation of Americans are not stepping forward and taking responsibility for the decisions that are being made today. And what this, in essence, constitutes then is taxation without representation because it will be our children and it will

be our grandchildren that will have to be the ones to clean up the fiscal mess that is being created today. And it is not fair to them because they too often are the neglected voices, the future of this country, when, in order to sell a certain type of philosophy or economic policy, you try convincing the American people that they can have it all. They can have this huge increase in defense spending that we are seeing right now and they can have a large tax cut at the same time which was exactly the same economic policy that was pursued in the 1980's and first part of the 1990's.

It has been said that what we are debating today is *deja voodoo economics* all over again. And I believe that because this is history repeating itself. Where we saw with the decisions made in the early 1980's led to a quadrupling of the national debt and the detrimental economic effect it had on our Nation, and now we are back in that same type of scenario. And it is not too late. And hopefully we will be able to engage in a bipartisan conversation in this Congress and get the President and his people back involved in this. And let us come up with a long term plan recognizing the short term demands on the Treasury that we currently have, the obligations to fight international terrorism, to do Iraq right, not only winning the war but winning the peace. But let us also have a long term plan in order to set up future Congresses and our kids for a chance to succeed with this aging population which we all know is going to happen and which everyone does not really want to talk too much about. But this is the time for us to make these decisions, not when we have 80 million Americans suddenly retiring and entering these very important programs. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman's remarks reminded me of a line from the President's State of the Union speech this year. Very early on in his speech he said that the paramount goal of his was that we shall not pass our problems and our challenges on to future Congresses. Now, I think what the President was alluding to at that point was Saddam Hussein and Iraq; and I happen to agree with him on that for one. I think it was bold and courageous to step up and address that problem and not pass it on to future Congresses.

But I could not help but be struck by the irony of a line saying, We shall not pass our problems on to future Congresses. If you think about it basically what he was saying was but we shall pass on the bill. That is not responsible. When you run up deficits like this, that the very definition of passing your problems on to future Congresses. It is irresponsible, unworkable, and not in the best interest of the future of this country. I am absolutely convinced we can do better, that we can put together a fiscally responsible budget that best

prepares us for the future and allows future economic growth.

I want to thank my colleagues again who came out to speak with me tonight on this issue. This is not the last time we will be talking about it. Fiscal responsibility is a never-ending job.

UGANDA AND THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE ACCOUNT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Congress is advancing the Millennium Challenge Account or the MCA, a bold initiative supporting economic growth and self-sufficiency in the world's poorest nations. I applaud MCA's focus on reforming poor nations that have demonstrated achievement in ruling justly, investing in people, and encouraging economic freedom. MCA should have a special emphasis on sub-Saharan Africa, the poorest region of the world with over 290 million people living on less than one dollar per day.

Several countries in sub-Saharan Africa are successfully addressing some of the most critical developmental challenges of our century, HIV/AIDS, poverty eradication, political reform and economic liberalization.

As our Nation prepares to launch MCA and make this important contribution to human and economic development, we can draw inspiration from countries such as Uganda. Uganda progress demonstrates that the developmental challenges confronting Africa are immense but not insurmountable.

Uganda was recognized by the World Bank/IMF as the first IDA or International Development Association country to adopt a comprehensive and participatory national strategy to eradicate poverty. As a result, Uganda's poverty rate dropped from 56 percent to 35 percent over the past 10 years. During this same period, Uganda has maintained a growth rate of over 6.5 percent. Uganda is leading the developing world in addressing its HIV/AIDS rate and its infection rate which fell from 30 percent 10 years ago to less than 7 percent today.

Over the last 12 years primary school enrollment in Uganda increased from 40 percent to 99 percent. This transformation helped Uganda to further distinguish itself as the first country to qualify for the World Bank's Heavily Indebted Poor Country debt relief initiative or HIPC.

Uganda's success is attributed to strong leadership and the government's establishment of broad-based public-private partnerships in health care, education, and economic development in rural communities and municipalities throughout the Nation.

The number of registered nongovernmental organizations and faith-based

groups working with local government administrators has more than doubled over the past 5 years. Uganda's successful development model also includes empowering women in government, in civil society and in enterprise development. The number of women in the governments rose from 22 percent to 45 percent in 4 years and a woman now serves as Vice President of Uganda.

Mr. Speaker, Uganda's record of achievement reflects good governance. President Museveni and his team have successfully transformed a war-torn and ethically divided country into one with strong democratic institutions. Uganda held successive elections in 1996 and 2001 that were certified as free and fair by national and international bodies. Additionally, the government has made the issue of multi-party system a transparent debate with the referendum in 2000 that was also certified as free and fair by the international community.

Voter turnout in Uganda is also admirable with the vast majority of eligible voters consistently turning out to vote. Uganda is now engaged in a national process to further refine its flourishing democracy.

While corruption continues to challenge Uganda, the government is making strides with the adoption of an aggressive anti-corruption strategy through the independent Office of the Inspector General. In partnership with the World Bank, Uganda instituted reforms to broaden the enforcement authority of the IGG and strengthen its ability to fight corruption. Public officials in Uganda must now among other things declare their wealth upon taking office and throughout the process of their holding office.

Mr. Speaker, Uganda's record speaks for itself. The Millennium Challenge Account should build on the African Growth and Opportunity Act. It should strengthen the capacity of progressive poor nations, such as Uganda, to realize further gains as they proceed on the arduous but promising path of reform and development.

AN ENERGY POLICY FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great time, as we come together to speak tonight, things are going well, thank heavens, in Iraq and I think we will actually see a time and place in

modern times when a country as strong as America is willing to go in and secure the freedom for other people. And so this is a time of great faith in America but it is also a time of problems. And, in fact, in Iraq in particular we see one of the side effects of that war has been a significant increase in the cost of oil and gas and energy for the people of America. So tonight 2 or 3 of us who are members of the Western Caucus would like to talk about energy policy in America and the need to pass the energy bill later this week.

A couple of things are important as we do that. In the first place, we need to protect the environment. That is essential. In the second place, we need to have a secure source of energy, and that needs to be largely domestic. And, finally, we need to have a reasonable price for ourselves and for future generations.

A little bit later I am going to talk about oil or gas exploration and development in America. I would like now to introduce a couple of my colleagues. I will start with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) who will take a couple of minutes to talk about some of the big ideas here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my senior colleague from Utah.

Mr. Speaker, when we entered this body a couple of months ago I was a high school teacher. And I have to admit it is somewhat difficult trying to raise 5 kids on a high school teacher's salary. One of the things that was most significant, most difficult, was always dealing with those essential energy costs that were coming to us, the higher utility rates, increased gas, always seeming at the whim of foreign changes that took place, and always without a comprehensive energy policy that this country vitally needs.

Those costs were ever escalating. And it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out, if you would just look at the chart we have here and follow the green line which is simply gasoline prices or gasoline production versus the red line which is prices. And you simply know as the green line goes down, prices go up. Now the inverse would also be true. If we could increase the supply, the cost would also go down.

There are those who claim that there is no way we can possibly increase our energy source without totally destroying our environment. Mr. Speaker, I have to reject that failed philosophy of the past. It is possible for us to secure our environment. We all want to drink clean water, to breathe clean air, to secure the land. But we can secure our environment by relying on modern technology to also provide us with the energy source we need and a domestic energy source that we desperately need. And we can do so not by dealing with foreign powers, but on land that we presently own and control.

In a minute, Mr. Speaker, I think one of my colleagues will go into detail about the Arctic National Wildlife Ref-

uge which has potential that is there on land that was put aside for that very purpose. A common sense approach for providing for our energy needs could be easily accomplished.

□ 2130

If we do nothing as a country, my bill worsens, my situation becomes more desperate. We can easily balance our political policy needs for energy with good environmentalism both for today and for tomorrow by simply putting politics aside and simply doing what is right to provide for my family, as well as for millions of people on a fixed income who need a stable and predictable domestic energy source, and if we reject what modern technology can do to provide that and provide for our environmental needs, we are moving this country's policy back 20 years.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Of course, I would.

Mr. CANNON. As I look at this chart, the green line is not oil production in America. That green line is oil production that has come through the trans-Alaska pipeline. So this is essentially the Alaskan oil that has come into America, and yet even that relatively small portion of the oil we bring into America from Alaska through that pipeline has had a dramatic effect on the price of oil elsewhere, and that is because I think the markets are so tight that small fluctuations in our resources make a huge difference in that price. Is that what that chart is saying?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah is absolutely correct, and it clearly illustrates the potential we have to make life better for Americans if we just use what we have in a common-sense approach to a domestic energy policy.

Mr. CANNON. When people talk about the ANWR producing only a tiny fraction of the energy we need, what we are really saying is that a small fraction of the energy has a huge influence on the price we pay at the pump?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), once again, is absolutely correct. It has a huge impact, and that small fraction is estimated somewhere in the neighborhood between 5 and 16 billion, with a B, barrels of recoverable oil.

Mr. CANNON. We have a chart later on that shows the various countries that produce oil that we bring into America and shows that that production in the new ANWR would actually be the second or third largest amount of oil we bring into America from any part of the world; is that not correct?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It would be exactly right. It would make a major impact on the domestic future and stability of energy sources in America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if I got this right from the chart there, we add ANWR to the system and bring that oil into America and prices, instead of